



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/768,161	01/24/2001	Robert P. Loce	105432	9226
27074	7590	08/13/2004	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC. P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			STREGE, JOHN B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2625	
DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/768,161	LOCE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	John B Strege	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2004.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-4,8-17 and 21-25 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 5-7 and 18-20 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 08 June 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                                        |                                                                             |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                                |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|                                                                                                                        | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

***Response to Amendment/Arguments***

In response to Applicants' amendment received 5/17/04, all requested changes to the specification and claims have been entered. New claims 24-25 have been added. Applicants' arguments, with respect to the rejections of claims 1-4, 8-17, and 21-23 under 35 USC 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Donelly et al. USPN 6,002,800 (hereinafter "Donelly").

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 8-17, and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Donelly USPN 6,002,800 in view of applicants' admitted prior art.

Donelly discloses an invention relating to detecting input image characteristics in a stream of pixel data to prevent forgeries or copies of bank notes from being made (col. 1 lines 5-8). The scanned image is fed to a control system which is able to manipulate the scanned image (col. 4 lines 22-23). The input characteristics are detected in the pixel stream by means of comparison of the pixel stream with a template stored in the ROM (col. 5 line 22). Donelly further discloses that In order to detect bank notes at all possible rotations and positions it is unrealistic to store a template for each

Art Unit: 2625

possible rotation or position, however if each cell of the template contains a range of information about the color and brightness of the bank note it is not necessary to store all possible orientations (col. 5 lines 33-39). Therefore the template data comprises the set of two range values that can be considered to be a loose template as defined by the applicants (col. 7 lines 16-37, and col. 15 lines 1-26). If the input image is characterized to be that of a bank note the printing device is disabled (col. 1 lines 25-26), thus the characterized image affects a second image.

Donelly does not explicitly disclose that the input image is an anti-aliased image. However it is well known in the art of image processing to process anti-aliased images, as admitted by the applicants (page 6 lines 1-6).

Donelly and the applicants' admitted prior art are analogous because they are from the same field of endeavor of characterizing input image data using a loose template.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to input an anti-aliased image to be processed by Donelly. Donelly is concerned with high quality color copiers which would produce anti-aliased images to retain the high quality printing. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Donelly and the applicants' admitted prior art to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claim 2, if the printer is disabled then it will affect the line width of the second image by not printing the line.

Regarding claim 3, Donelly discloses that the input image is divided into group areas (corresponding to extracting one or more portions from the input image) and a template comparison is carried out for each group area (col. 5 lines 65-67).

Regarding claim 4, if the characteristics of the image match those of a bank note then the printer is disabled, thus arbitrating is taking place.

Regarding claim 8, Donelly discloses a vector 58 associated with the templates (col. 7 lines 1-2).

Regarding claim 9, if the input is an anti-aliased image it would be obvious that if the image is copied the output should also be anti-aliased.

Regarding claim 10, it is well known to reduce the resolution of an image using a template, thus the Examiner declares official notice. It would be obvious to reduce the resolution in a copier to print documents that need not necessarily be of a high quality at a faster rate.

Regarding claim 11, as discussed the input portion is compared to a template.

Regarding claim 12, if the resolution is changed then the line width of the second image must also be changed.

Regarding claim 13, look up tables are well known in the art, therefore Official Notice is declared. The motivation for using a look up table is that a corresponding value can be found quickly and with little processing time.

Claim 14 has similar limitations to claim 1 only it is less specific, thus the loose-templates have been discussed above, and the control device affects the second image by disabling the printer as discussed above.

Claim 15-17, and 21-23 disclose similar limitations to those discussed above for claims 2-4 and 8-13 and therefore the same arguments can be used for their rejection.

Claims 24-25 are also similar to claims 1 and 14, thus the same arguments applied for claims 1 and 14 apply equally to claims 24-25.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. Claims 5-7 and 18-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John B Strege whose telephone number is (703) 305-8679. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday between the hours of 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on (703) 308-5246. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JS



BHAVESH M. MEHTA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600